



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/723,265	11/27/2000	William R. Rohrbach	ROHRBACH 8-13	4313
47394	7590	05/23/2005	EXAMINER	
HITT GAINES, PC LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC. PO BOX 832570 RICHARDSON, TX 75083			APPIAH, CHARLES NANA	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2686

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/723,265	ROHRBACH ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Charles Appiah	2686	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 May 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See attached.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

13. Other: _____.


CHARLES APPIAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

In response to Applicant's argument that "Lebowitz and Barringer, therefore, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest establishing in a wireless voice network a wireless link of diminished bandwidth, insufficient to provide commercially-acceptable quality of service standards for voice communication as recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 15, examiner maintains that the combination of Lebowitz and Barringer meets the limitations of the invention as claimed in that the claimed limitation of establishing in a wireless voice network a WIRELESS LINK OF DIMINISHED BANDWIDTH INSUFFICIENT TO PROVIDE COMMERCIALY-ACCEPTABLE QUALITY O SERVICE STANDARDS FOR VOICE COMMUNINCATION does not call for a voice communication over a voice channel and furthermore the WIRELESS VOICE NETWORK recitation is an intended use limitation and as such Lebowith as modified by Barringer reads on the reicited limitations.

Additionally the combination of Lebowitz and Barringer is proper since Lebowitz for example states that the two systems of Fig. 1 and Fig. 1A could be combined into a single integrated system providing both voice and data transmission (see Lebowitz, col. 8, lines 26-49), and Barringer's use of control channels to transmit data meets the limitation of "a wireless link of diminished bandwidth insufficient to provide commercially-acceptable quality of service standards for voice communication". since the claim does not call for a wireless link of diminished bandwidth SUFFICIENT to provide commercially-acceptable quality of service standards for voice communicaiton.

In regard to Applicant's argument that the combination of Fish with Lebowirtz is improper because Lebowitz employs CDPD technology that sends data packets along idle channels of exisiting cellular voicè networks, and Fish on the other, hand, teaches sending data during allocated time slots, would like to draw Applicat's attention to Lebowitz - col. 8, lines 26-49, suggesting a single integrated system providing both voice and data transmission and hence the combination of Lebowitz and Fish is proper and maintained.